To American Friends

Reg. No. B 3092

HARIJAN

12 Pages

Editor : MAHADEV DESAI

VOL. IX, NO. 30] AHMEDABAD — SUNDAY, AUGUST 9, 1942 [TWO ANNAS

UNSEEMLY IF TRUE

(*By M. K. Gandhi*)

Asaf Ali Saheb, President of the Delhi P. C. C. writes:

"The enclosed complaint was first brought up before the Delhi Provincial Congress Committee. The writer has now secured two supporters. I know the writer personally as a truthful and unbiased nationalist and I believe his word.

"I had heard of the *Rastriya Swayam Sevak Sangh* and its activities; and I also knew that it was a communal organisation. The slogan and the speech complained of have been brought to my notice for the first time. I can think of no means of counteracting the effect of such slogans and speeches on other communities, except inviting your attention to them. Perhaps you will take notice of it in the *Harijan*."

The complainant's letter is in Urdu. Its purport is that the organisation referred to in Asaf Ali Saheb's letter consisting of 3,000 members goes through a daily lathi drill which is followed by reciting the slogan, 'Hindustan belongs to Hindus and to nobody else.' This recital is followed by a brief discourse in which speakers say: 'Drive out the English first and then we shall subjugate the Muslims. If they do not listen, we shall kill them.' Taking the evidence at its face value, the slogan is wrong and the central theme of the discourse is worse. I can only hope that the slogan is unauthorised and that the speaker who is reported to have uttered the sentiments ascribed to him was no responsible person. The slogan is wrong and absurd, for Hindustan belongs to all those who are born and bred here and who have no other country to look to. Therefore, it belongs to Parsis, Beni Israels, to Indian Christians, Muslims and other non-Hindus as much as to Hindus. Free India will be no Hindu raj, it will be Indian raj based not on the majority of any religious sect or community but on the representatives of the whole people without distinction of religion. I can conceive a mixed majority putting the Hindus in a minority. They would be elected for their record of service and merits. Religion is a personal matter which should have no place in politics. It is in the unnatural condition of foreign domination that we have unnatural divisions according to religion. Foreign domination going, we shall laugh at our folly in having clung to false ideals and slogans.

The discourse referred to is surely vulgar. There is no question of 'driving out' the English. They cannot be driven out except by violence superior to theirs. The idea of killing the Muslims if they do not remain in subjection may have been all right in bygone days; it has no meaning today. There is no force in the cry of driving out the English if the substitute is to be Hindu or any other domination. That will be no Swaraj. Self-government necessarily means government by the free and intelligent will of the people. I add the word 'intelligent' because, I hope that India will be predominantly non-violent. Members of society based on non-violence must all be so educated as to be able to think and act for themselves. If their thought and action be one, it will be because they are directed both to a common goal and common result even as the thought and action of a hundred men pulling a rope in one direction would be one.

I hope that those in charge of the Swayam Sevak Sangh will inquire into the complaint and take the necessary steps.

AN APPROPRIATE QUESTION

(*By M. K. Gandhi*)

I take the following from the *Hindu*:

"The *Manchester Guardian*, in an editorial commenting on the Wardha resolution, says that the resolution suggested that if Britain would immediately withdraw, India would help her and the Allies to 'resist aggression'. In India, as here, it is being asked what is meant by 'resistance'. Would it be armed resistance or would it be 'resistance' of the kind which Mr. Gandhi has always advocated — non-violent non-co-operation? The text of the resolution ought to settle the question, but it does not. Pandit Nehru and some other Congress leaders have said that they themselves believe in offering armed resistance, provided that Britain makes the necessary political concessions. But Mr. Gandhi's belief is that Indians would most effectively 'resist' Japan and any other aggressor by pure non-violence. How is Britain to know what sort of 'resistance' the proposed Indian Government would organise, concludes the *Manchester Guardian*."

This is a good question. But who can speak for the proposed Indian Government? It must be clear that it won't be Congress Government; nor will it be Hindu Maha Sabha Government, nor Muslim League Government. It will be all India Government. It will be a government not backed by any military power unless the so-called military classes seize the opportunity and overawe the populace and declare themselves the Government as Franco has done. If they play the game then the proposed Government would be a government though provisional in the first instance, broad-based upon the will of the people. Let us assume that the military minded persons being without the backing of the powerful British arms will think wise not to seize power. The popular Government to be must represent Parsis, Jews, Indian Christians, Muslims and Hindus

not as separate religious groups but as Indians. The vast majority won't be believers in non-violence. The Congress does not believe in non-violence as a creed. Very few go to the extreme length I do as the *Manchester Guardian* properly puts it. The Maulana and Pandit Nehru 'believe in offering armed resistance'. And I may add so do many Congressmen. Therefore, whether in the country as a whole or in the Congress I shall be in a hopeless minority. But for me even if I find myself in a minority of one my course is clear. My non-violence is on its trial. I hope I shall come out unscathed through the ordeal. My faith in its efficacy is unflinching. If I could turn India, Great Britain, America and the rest of the world including the Axis Powers in the direction of non-violence I should do so. But that feat mere human effort cannot accomplish. That is in God's hands. For me 'I can but do or die'. Surely the *Manchester Guardian* does not fear the real article, genuine non-violence. Nobody does nor need.

DRAFT RESOLUTION

(The Congress Working Committee has passed the following resolution, which will be placed before the A. I. C. C. at Bombay, on August 7th.)

The All India Congress Committee has given the most careful consideration to the reference made to it by the Working Committee in their resolution dated July 14, 1942, and to the subsequent events, including the development of the war situation, the utterances of responsible spokesmen of the British Government, and the comments and criticisms made in India and abroad. The Committee approves of and endorses that resolution and is of opinion that events subsequent to it have given it further justification, and have made it clear that the immediate ending of British rule in India is an urgent necessity, both for the sake of India and for the success of the cause of the United Nations. The continuation of that rule is degrading and enfeebling India and making her progressively less capable of defending herself and of contributing to the cause of world freedom.

The Committee has viewed with dismay the deterioration of the situation on the Russian and Chinese fronts and conveys to the Russian and Chinese peoples its high appreciation of their heroism in defence of their freedom. This increasing peril makes it incumbent on all those who strive for freedom and who sympathise with the victims of aggression, to examine the foundations of the policy so far pursued by the Allied Nations, which has led to repeated and disastrous failure. It is not by adhering to such aims and policies and methods that failure can be converted into success, for past experience has shown that failure is inherent in them. These policies have been based not on freedom so much as on the domination of subject and colonial countries, and the continuation of the imperialist tradition and method. The possession of Empire, instead of adding to the strength of the ruling power, has become a burden and a curse. India, the classic land of modern Imperialism, has become the crux of the question, for by the freedom of India will Britain and the United Nations be judged, and the people of Asia and Africa be filled with hope and enthusiasm.

The ending of British rule in this country is thus a vital and immediate issue on which depend the future of the war and the success of freedom and democracy. A free India will assure this success by throwing all her great resources in the struggle for freedom and against the aggression of Nazism, Fascism and Imperialism. This will not only affect materially the fortunes of the war, but will bring all subject and oppressed humanity on the side of the United Nations, and give these nations, whose ally India would be, the moral and spiritual leadership of the world. India in bondage will continue to be the symbol of British Imperialism and the taint of that Imperialism will affect the fortunes of all the United Nations.

The peril of today, therefore, necessitates the independence of India and the ending of British domination. No future promises or guarantees can affect the present situation or meet that peril. They cannot produce the needed psychological effect on the mind of the masses. Only the glow of freedom now can release that energy and enthusiasm of millions of people which will immediately transform the nature of the war.

The A. I. C. C. therefore repeats with all emphasis the demand for the withdrawal of the British power from India. On the declaration of India's independence, a provisional government will be formed and Free India will become an ally of the United Nations, sharing with them in the trials and tribulations of the joint enterprise of the struggle for freedom. The provisional government can only be formed by the cooperation of the principal parties and groups in the country. It will thus be a composite government, representative of all important sections of the people of India. Its primary functions must be to defend India and resist aggression with all the armed as well as the non-violent forces at its command, together with the Allied powers, and to promote the well-being and progress of the workers in the fields and factories and elsewhere, to whom essentially all power and authority must belong. The provisional government will evolve a scheme for a constituent assembly which will prepare a constitution for the governance of India acceptable to all sections of the people. This constitution, according to the Congress view, should be a federal one, with the largest measure of autonomy for the federating units, and with the residuary powers vesting in these units. The future relations between India and the allied nations will be adjusted by representatives of all these free countries conferring together for their mutual advantage and for their cooperation in the common task of resisting aggression. Freedom will enable India to resist aggression effectively with the peoples' united will and strength behind it.

The freedom of India must be the symbol of and prelude to the freedom of all other Asiatic nations under foreign domination. Burma, Malaya, Indo-China, the Dutch Indies, Iran and Iraq must also attain their complete freedom. It must be clearly understood that such of these countries as are under Japanese control now must not subsequently be placed under the rule or control of any other colonial power.

While the A. I. C. C. must primarily be concerned with the independence and defence of India in this hour of danger, the Committee is of opinion that the

future peace, security and ordered progress of the world demand a world federation of free nations, and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved. Such a world federation would ensure the freedom of its constituent nations, the prevention of aggression and exploitation by one nation over another, the protection of national minorities, the advancement of all backward areas and peoples, and the pooling of the world's resources for the common good of all. On the establishment of such a world federation, disarmament would be practicable in all countries, national armies, navies and air forces would no longer be necessary, and a world federal defence force would keep the world peace and prevent aggression.

An independent India would gladly join such a world federation and cooperate on an equal basis with other countries in the solution of international problems.

Such a federation should be open to all nations who agree with its fundamental principles. In view of the war, however, the federation must inevitably, to begin with, be confined to the United Nations. Such a step taken now will have a most powerful effect on the war, on the peoples of the Axis countries, and on the peace to come.

The Committee regretfully realises, however, that despite the tragic and overwhelming lessons of the war and the perils that overhang the world, the governments of few countries are yet prepared to take this inevitable step towards world federation. The reactions of the British Government and the misguided criticisms of the foreign press also make it clear that even the obvious demand for India's independence is resisted, though this has been made essentially to meet the present peril and to enable India to defend herself and help China and Russia in their hour of need. The Committee is anxious not to embarass in any way the defence of China or Russia, whose freedom is precious and must be preserved, or to jeopardise the defensive capacity of the United Nations. But the peril grows both to India and these nations, and inaction and submission to a foreign administration at this stage is not only degrading India and reducing her capacity to defend herself and resist aggression, but is no answer to that growing peril and is no service to the peoples of the United Nations. The earnest appeal of the Working Committee to Great Britain and the United Nations has so far met with no response, and criticism made in many foreign quarters have shown an ignorance of India's and the world's need, and sometimes even hostility to India's freedom, which is significant of a mentality of domination and racial superiority which cannot be tolerated by a proud people conscious of their strength and of the justice of their cause.

The A. I. C. C. would yet again, at this last moment, in the interest of world freedom, renew this appeal to Britain and the United Nations. But the Committee feels that it is no longer justified in holding the nation back from endeavouring to assert its will against an imperialist and authoritarian government, which dominates over and prevents it from functioning in its own interest and in the interest of humanity. The Committee resolves, therefore, to sanction, for the vindication of India's inalienable right to freedom and independence, the starting of a mass struggle on non-violent lines on widest possible scale, so that the country might utilise all the non-violent strength it has gathered during the last twentytwo years of peaceful struggle. Such a struggle must inevitably be under the leadership of Gandhiji and the Committee requests him to take the lead and guide the nation in the steps to be taken.

The Committee appeals to the people of India to face the dangers and hardships that will fall to their lot with courage and endurance, and to hold together under the leadership of Gandhiji, and carry out his instructions as disciplined soldiers of Indian freedom. They must remember that non-violence is the basis of this movement. A time may come when it may not be possible to issue instructions or for instructions to reach our people, and when no Congress committees can function. When this happens, every man and woman, who is participating in this movement must function for himself or herself within the four corners of the general instructions issued. Every Indian who desires freedom and strives for it must be his own guide urging him on along the hard road where there is no resting place and which leads ultimately to the independence and deliverance of India.

Lastly, whilst the A. I. C. C. has stated its own view of the future governance under free India the A. I. C. C. wishes to make it quite clear to all concerned that by embarking on mass struggle it has no intention of gaining power for the Congress. The power, when it comes, will belong to the whole people of India.

CHARKHA JAYANTI

(By M. K. Gandhi)

'Gandhi Jayanti' is just a pretext, the real thing is Charkha Jayanti. Had there been no charkha, there would perhaps have been no Jayanti (Birthday) celebrations, and even if there had been such celebrations, they would have had little importance. There is no point in having birthday celebrations of any person without any definite end in view, otherwise they must be confined to just the innocent rejoicings of relatives and friends. But because Gandhi Jayanti has been turned into Charkha Jayanti —a great and comprehensive end—the celebration has assumed a national importance and comprehensive end in view.

The Charkha Sangh has decided to celebrate the Jayanti by collecting funds for khadi work, by enlisting self-spinners, and making yarn collections. In fixing up its programme it has had before it the example of Shri Narandas Gandhi's annual work in this direction. He and those who associate with him pledge themselves to do a certain amount of work each year, and he has had more and more success every year. There is no reason why such success should not attend the Charkha Sangh's efforts. Only it needs workers with a will to bring the work to fruition. Without khadi there may come a time when people may have to go without any clothing. Only the Charkha Sangh can prevent this catastrophe. I hope that all will cooperate with the Sangh in its noble endeavour.

Sevagram, 22-7-'42

(From *Khadi Jagat*)

HARIJAN
August 9 1942

TO AMERICAN FRIENDS

Dear Friends,

As I am supposed to be the spirit behind the much discussed and equally well abused resolution of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress on Independence, it has become necessary for me to explain my position. For I am not unknown to you. I have in America perhaps the largest number of friends in the West — not even excepting Great Britain. British friends knowing me personally are more discerning than the American. In America I suffer from the well known malady called hero worship. Good Dr. Holmes, until recently of the Unity Church of New York, without knowing me personally became my advertising agent. Some of the nice things he said about me I never knew myself. So I receive often embarrassing letters from America expecting me to perform miracles. Dr. Holmes was followed much later by the late Bishop Fisher who knew me personally in India. He very nearly dragged me to America but fates had ordained otherwise and I could not visit your vast and great country with its wonderful people.

Moreover, you have given me a teacher in Thoreau, who furnished me through his essay on the 'Duty of Civil Disobedience' scientific confirmation of what I was doing in South Africa. Great Britain gave me Ruskin, whose 'Unto This Last' transformed me overnight from a lawyer and city-dweller into a rustic living away from Durban on a farm, three miles from the nearest railway station and Russia gave me in Tolstoi, a teacher who furnished a reasoned basis for my non-violence. He blessed my movement in South Africa when it was still in its infancy and of whose wonderful possibilities I had yet to learn. It was he who had prophesied in his letter to me that I was leading a movement which was destined to bring a message of hope to the down-trodden people of the earth. So you will see that I have not approached the present task in any spirit of enmity to Great Britain and the West. After having imbibed and assimilated the message of 'Unto This Last', I could not be guilty of approving of Fascism or Nazism, whose cult is suppression of the individual and his liberty.

I invite you to read my formula of withdrawal or as it has been popularly called 'Quit India' with this background. You may not read into it more than the context warrants.

I claim to be a votary of truth from my childhood. It was the most natural thing to me. My prayerful search gave me the revealing maxim 'Truth is God' instead of the usual one 'God is Truth'. That maxim enables me to see God face to face as it were. I feel Him pervade every fibre of my being. With this Truth as witness between you and me, I assert that I would not have asked my country to invite Great Britain to withdraw her rule over India, irrespective of any demand to the contrary, if I had not seen at once that for the sake of Great Britain and the Allied cause it was necessary for Britain boldly to perform the duty of freeing India from bondage. Without this essential act of tardy justice, Britain could not justify her position before the unmurmuring World Conscience, which is there nevertheless. Singapore, Malaya and Burma taught me that the disaster must not be repeated in India. I make bold to say that it cannot be averted unless Britain trusts the people of India to use their liberty in favour of the Allied cause. By that supreme act of justice Britain would have taken away all cause for the seething discontent of India. She will turn the growing ill-will into active good-will. I submit that it is worth all the battleships and airships that your wonder working engineers and financial resources can produce.

I know that interested propaganda has filled your ears and eyes with distorted versions of the Congress position. I have been painted as a hypocrite and enemy of Britain under disguise. My demonstrable spirit of accommodation has been described as my inconsistency, proving me to be an utterly unreliable man. I am not going to burden this letter with proof in support of my assertions. If the credit I have enjoyed in America will not stand me in good stead, nothing I may argue in self-defence will carry conviction against the formidable but false propaganda that has poisoned American ears.

You have made common cause with Great Britain. You cannot therefore disown responsibility for anything that her representatives do in India. You will do a grievous wrong to the Allied cause, if you do not sift the truth from the chaff whilst there is yet time. Just think of it. Is there anything wrong in the Congress demanding unconditional recognition of India's Independence? It is being said, 'But this is not the time.' We say, 'This is the psychological moment for that recognition. For then and then only can there be irresistible opposition to Japanese aggression. It is of immense value to the Allied cause if it is also of equal value to India. The Congress has anticipated and provided for every possible difficulty in the way of recognition. I want you to look upon the immediate recognition of India's Independance as a war measure of first class magnitude.

I am
Your Friend,
M. K. Gandhi

On way to Bombay, 3-8-'42

Just Published

Non-violence in Peace and War

By Gandhiji

An up-to-date collection of Gandhiji's writings and utterances on non-violence in relation to war and to internal disorders and on non-violent resistance as applicable to situations in other countries, such as faced the Jews and the Czechs, the Chinese and the Negroes — people who are victims of ruthless oppression or wanton aggression.

Foreword by Mahadev Desai

Pages 608 *Price Rs. 4* *Postage As. 10*

Can be had at Navajivan Office, Post Box 105, Ahmedabad; 130 Princess St., Bombay; Surat and Rajkot.

QUESTION BOX

(By M. K. Gandhi)

What Editors Can Do

Q. What do you expect the editors to do in the crisis that has overtaken us?

A. I am proud of the way the Indian Press as a whole has reacted to the Congress resolution. The acid test has yet to come. I hope that the Press will then fearlessly represent the national cause. It is better not to issue newspapers than to issue them under a feeling of suppression. At the same time I do not want them to be blind followers of the Congress and to endorse what their reason or conscience rebels against. The national cause will never suffer by honest criticism of national institutions and national policies. The danger to be guarded against is the inflaming of communal passions. The forthcoming movement will mean nothing if it does not end in bringing communal harmony and honourable peace with the British people. Whatever may be said to the contrary I maintain that the Congress policy has been framed in no hostile spirit against the British people. For the spirit behind the policy is wholly non-violent. I do hope, therefore, that the Press will warn those who have the nation's cause at heart against countenancing violence either against the British people or among ourselves. It must retard our progress towards our goal.

On the way to Bombay, 3-8-'42

World Federation

Q. Instead of striving for India's freedom why would you not strive for a far greater and nobler end—world federation? Surely that will automatically include India's freedom as the greater includes the less.

A. There is an obvious fallacy in this question. Federation is undoubtedly a greater and nobler end for free nations. It is a greater and nobler end for them to strive to promote federation than be self-centred, seeking only to preserve their own freedom. They are finding it difficult if not impossible for individuals to retain freedom without a combination. It has become a necessity while the war lasts and it would be good if they voluntarily pledge themselves now, to remain united even after the war. Defeat of any one member should make no difference. The survivors will not rest content till the defeated member is avenged. Still this won't be a world federation. It would be a mere defensive alliance between a certain combination. The very first step to a world federation is to recognise the freedom of conquered and exploited nations. Thus, India and Africa have to be freed. The second step would be to announce to and assure the aggressor powers, in the present instance, the Axis powers, that immediately the war ends, they will be recognised as members of the world federation in the same sense as the Allies. This presupposes an agreement among the members of the world federation as to the irreducible fundamentals. If this is not forthcoming, the federation will fall to pieces under the slightest strain. Therefore it has to come about voluntarily. I suggest that non-violence is the basis of voluntariness. It is because of all the nations of the world India is the one nation which has a message, however limited and crude it may be, in that direction that it must have immediate freedom to enable it to play its part. You may not quote against me Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I know that they do not hold the view I hold on non-violence. When India gets her freedom the probability is that I shall no longer be wanted by any party and everybody would be war-mad. Nevertheless there will be, I am quite sure, a respectable number of votaries of non-violence who will make their contribution. But this subject is not germane to the question. Moreover, I am discussing that aspect more fully elsewhere. I hope you will agree with me that India, in seeking first to be free, is not retarding federation. It wants her freedom for the sake of the nations in distress, especially China and Russia and for the whole of humanity—in your language world-federation. You will also, I hope, see that no universal federation is possible without India becoming free now. It would be an earnest too of the Allied declarations.

What about Nepal?

Q. When India is free will she treat Nepal as an independent country that she is now or will she be annexed to Free India?

A. If I know India's mind at all, having tasted the bitter fruit of dependence, she will not want to annex or steal any country. She can have no imperial ambition. Nepal therefore will be an honoured and independent neighbour. I am not sure that Nepal is as independent as you think it is. But I do not know enough of Nepal to challenge your statement. I hope that you are wholly right.

Sevagram

UNWORTHY PROPAGANDA

One can only hope that Sir Stafford Cripps in his broadcast to America spoke hastily and without full knowledge of what Gandhiji had been writing, or depended on extracts wrenched out of their context, wired out by Reuter from Gandhiji's writings and statements. For he has been unwittingly guilty of suggesting false things by suppressing the true. As he has devoted the address largely to Gandhiji and quoted a number of his statements I must at the risk of making this statement lengthy prove the truth of what I am saying. Thus he quotes Gandhiji as having said: 'anarchy is the only way.' I have looked in vain for this statement in his writings. All he said was: "If there is anarchy in India, Britain alone will be responsible not I. What I have said is that I would prefer anarchy to the present slavery and consequent impotence of India." (Gandhiji's reply to the *London Times*.) He also said: "Under my proposal, they have to leave India in God's hands—but in modern parlance, to anarchy, and that anarchy may lead to internecine warfare for a time or to unrestrained dacoities. From these a true India will rise in the place of the false one we see." Again he said: "I have mentioned anarchy. It is a misnomer to call such rule as is established in India a rule which promotes the welfare of India. Therefore this ordered anarchy should go, and if there is complete lawlessness in India, as a

result, I would risk it, though I believe, that 22 years of continuous effort at educating India along the lines of non-violence will not have gone in vain, and people will evolve real popular order out of chaos." The Working Committee's resolution paraphrased this when it said: "The Congress realises that there may be risks involved in such a course. Such risks, however, have to be taken by any country in order to achieve freedom, and more especially at the present critical juncture in order to save the country and the larger cause of freedom the world over from far greater risks and perils." He has said again and again that if Britain makes an orderly withdrawal, it should not be difficult for responsible men in India to bring into being a provisional Government. It is cruel distortion to assert that the Congress is manoeuvring to win party power out of the present crisis. As early as May 24th he wrote: "Sir Stafford Cripps could have asked either the Congress or the League to form the Cabinet. If he had done so, probably the party they entrusted with responsibility would have succeeded in having the cooperation of the other party. In any event Government would then have dealt with the real representatives of the people, rather than having their own nominees." This should apply with greater force after the orderly withdrawal that the Congress has asked for.

I wonder if Reuter thought it fit to wire to London the suggestion of the Congress President that the British Government should hand over charge to a representative organisation, be it the Muslim League or the Congress. The Congress would certainly not mind the charge being handed over to the Muslim League which may be trusted to form a provisional Government in consultation with other parties. All that the Congress wants is the freedom of India to be enjoyed by all the people. The other political parties do not want the continuance of the present dependent status. Their objection to the civil resistance programme cannot be taken to be an objection to the demand of the Congress. The Muslim League's claim to a division of India is not relevant in this connection but is only a matter of determination by a Free India when its constitution comes to be settled.

To charge Gandhiji or the Congress with contriving to 'thwart the United Nations' drive for victory' is to anticipate the result of a Civil Disobedience movement which would not be necessary, if the simple demand of the Congress is granted, and this demand is made with a view to ensuring speedy victory. Sir Stafford Cripps quotes a sentence from Gandhiji's article written on April 16, when he said: "American aid amounts in the end to American influence, if not American rule added to the British.. If the British left India to her fate probably the Japanese would leave India alone." This was written before Gandhiji felt compelled to make the demand for withdrawal of the British Power. Since he made that suggestion, he has been dealing with the necessary incidence of withdrawal and has said again and again that the British and American troops may operate from India in order to defend China and resist Japanese aggression, under a treaty entered into with Free India. "Free India simply becomes the ally of the Allied Powers, if only out of gratefulness for the payment of a debt, however overdue. Human nature thanks the debtor when he discharges the debt," he said in reply to a question by the representative of the Associated Press of America early in June. On June 14th he wrote: "Assuming that the national Government is formed and if it answers my expectations, its first act would be to enter into a treaty with the United Nations for defensive operations against aggressive powers, it being common cause that India will have nothing to do with any of the Fascist Powers and India would be morally bound to help the United Nations." Again he wrote in the *Harijan* of July 5th: "The Allied troops will be operating in India with the sole object of preventing Japanese attack. After all India is as much interested as the Allies in warding off the attack."

In face of these statements it is grossly unfair for one in Sir Stafford Cripps' position to quote what Gandhiji wrote in April last, and to suggest that he demanded that the British should walk out of India leaving the country without any constitutional form of Government, or that the Allied troops should be withdrawn from India. The worst that can be said about him is that he was inconsistent. His inconsistencies ought to be regarded as a powerful evidence of his reasonableness and readiness to correct errors and fill in omissions.

Some of Sir Stafford's statements cannot be explained away as hasty or made without full knowledge. For him to say that he had offered to put in immediate office a body of ministers like those who advise the American President is a travesty of fact. The position of the Cabinet of Ministers advising the American President is entirely different from the position of the ministers proposed to be set up by Sir Stafford Cripps to advise the Viceroy. However large the powers of the President of America, he is a duly elected representative of the people of America whereas the Viceroy is a British citizen appointed by the British Cabinet to rule over India with autocratic powers.

Nor will anybody be deceived by his statement that he had offered to the Indian people 'complete liberty to devise and set up their own form of Government'. It was a liberty coupled with the liberty given in advance to all the reactionary elements to destroy that liberty.

One may hope that Sir Stafford will realise that untruth besides doing an injustice to Gandhiji must ultimately harm the Allied cause. With the unlimited military strength behind him he may not mind the impotent rage of a wronged people. But as a humanitarian he may be expected to correct himself and tell the American public that the Congress demand far from containing anything that can injure war effort seeks to create the very conditions essential for Allied victory.

Sevagram, 30-7-'42 M. D.

WAYS OF NON-VIOLENT NON-COOPERATION

Ever since 1920 we are familiar with some of the ways of offering non-violent non-cooperation. These included boycott of all government institutions, services, and extended to the non-payment of taxes. They were directed against a foreign government in occupation of the country for years. The ways of non-cooperation to adopt against a new foreign invader would naturally differ in details. It would, as Gandhiji has said, extend to the refusal of food or water. All non-cooperation calculated to make the functioning of the enemy impossible has to be resorted to, within the limits of non-violence. Non-cooperation is an old remedy — as old as the hills. Members of caste organizations have organized it against their caste-fellows, often to almost unconscionable limits. Untouchability perhaps arose out of it, and it indicates the evil in which unwise, indiscreet, and unlimited use of it could result. As amongst members of the same national or social being its use can be of the most restricted and temporary character. It can come into natural, full and most effective play against those bent on making slaves of us, and then its use is limited, as I have said, only by non-violence.

The very first thing a foreign invader seeking to establish domination over and enslave the country needs labour, and it is in that respect that he should be confronted with stubborn resistance. Thus several million Poles are working as agricultural labourers in Germany, and labour conscription is being carried out by the Japanese on a staggering scale. Mr. Harrison Forman, writing in the *New York Times*, says that 'from 1936 to the present, more than 10,000,000 Chinese labourers and their families have been forced to go to Manchuria to participate in Japan's exploitation projects. . . . An example is given by the *Yung Pao*, puppet newspaper in Tientsin, which reveals that the Japanese conscripted 135,689 workers in the first six months of 1940 from Tientsin alone. Most of the labourers are obtained through sheer brute force. Whole villages are sometimes surrounded and all able-bodied farmers whisked off before any resistance can be offered.' It is here that non-cooperation can play a large part. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that moral subjection is far worse than physical, and that death should be always preferred to cooperation with the enemy.

A few of the forms successfully adopted in other countries in smaller but similar situations may be described here. Drew Pearson was in China a little before he visited India in 1923. The great strike of the Chinese sailors was going on at Hong Kong when he was there. He narrated to me the story of what he actually saw:

"They stopped the issue of railway tickets to the strikers to prevent them from going away. They marched on foot. Just where the British and Chinese boundaries met there were British soldiers ready with shot and shell, to shoot the strikers down. That spread a horror in the town. Every Chinaman — young or old, man, woman or child — struck work. The whites were flabbergasted. Their women did not know cooking, and there were no Chinese cooks to be had. The women could not take care of their children, and there were no Chinese nurses to be had. There were no rikshawallas, no watermen. All business was at a standstill. The whites saw their helplessness and yielded, and the strike ended with 30 per cent increase in wages for the sailors. An English captain of a steamship in the Yangtse told me that once his ship came in collision with some Chinese boats which capsized. As soon as the ship cast anchor, all the Chinese workmen on board struck work; no cooks, no water-carriers; all shops closed. The strike was called off only on the captain agreeing to pay an indemnity of 10,000 dollars. The captain of an American steamship had, under similar circumstances, to pay as indemnity seven times as much . . . The Chinese know now that the only remedy against white exploiters is non-violent resistance — strikes."

Devere Allen in his book *The Fight for Peace* describes a strike in Germany which was equally triumphant and which is a still more striking example. 'German militarism, monarchism, nationalism and reaction died hard,' he writes. "In 1920 Dr. Kapp, the instrument of backward-looking forces bent on gaining control of the situation, organised *a putsch* (a secret drive) to take control of Berlin and thence to capture power throughout the nation. His effort failed, and as a commentator has said, 'the fact that it failed was momentous'." Why it failed and the conditions of its collapse are told vividly by Wilfred Wellock, a Labour Member of Parliament:

"I was staying in Berlin and I was living in the centre of the city. On a particular Friday night, quite unknown to anybody, a few thousand troops marched into Berlin and took possession of the city. During Saturday and Sunday a general strike was organized by the workers of Berlin, and it was the most complete general strike that has taken place in any part of the world. By Sunday evening that strike was in perfect order, and on Monday morning there was not a single service running; gas and electricity were cut off, water was allowed to run, but it was impossible to have any cooked food, and so on, for a period of four or five days, and the result was the government, who were previously opposed to a general strike were glad to welcome it as the only means of saving the situation. It did save the situation, and without a safety-valve of that kind any country is liable to be in a very queer street when certain situations arise. The result was that the following Thursday evening the whole action of the Kapp *putsch* fell to pieces, and terms were made. I stood on that Thursday evening in the Leipzigerstrasse at the foot of Wilhelmstrasse, and I watched a few thousand troops, according to the terms of the agreement, march out of the city, defeated by a defenceless mass of people who had operated a very successful general strike."

Another case of prolonged non-violent non-cooperation on a much bigger scale that I should like to mention here is that of the resistance in Ruhr. In December 1922 the Reparations Commission declared Germany in voluntary default in respect of timber deliveries and France claimed

that under clause 18 of the Treaty of Versailles this declaration entitled her to take separate action. 'Germany contended', says the writer of the *Encyclopaedia* article on Ruhr, 'that the occupation constituted a breach of the Treaty of Versailles and a military invasion of a defenceless country in time of peace. She decided to oppose it by every means except armed resistance.' The Coal Syndicate moved its seat from Essen to Hamburg, rendering it impossible for the French to get an insight into the system of production and despatch of coal and coke.

"The French declared officially that a peaceful mission of engineers had been despatched to Essen with a few troops to protect them. So great was the detestation of the Ruhr workers for militarism that no German troops had ever been stationed in the district; the men's leaders now declard that they would somehow make the French realise that bayonets were ill-adapted to coal-hewing. Three days later the French occupied Buer, Bochum, and Dortmund. The German government prohibited any further reparation deliveries or payments to the invading powers. On January 15th the first blood was shed when French sentries fired into a crowd, killing one man and wounding others. A military order to six directors of Thyssen's, Krupp's and other industrial concerns to deliver coal to France met with a refusal; the directors were arrested and tried by a court-martial which imposed heavy fines."

Giving details of the German resistance, the writer of the *Encyclopaedia Brittanica* article proceeds:

"The French decided to break German obstinacy at all costs, but the more frequently the troops resorted to physical violence, the more the resistance stiffened. The German police now became openly hostile; they were frequently arrested and severely handled or deported. Telegraph and telephone operators refused to work for the invaders, and the French occupied their offices, cutting off the civil population from this means of communication. The railwaymen, in accordance with the orders of their government, also refused to work, and, as troops occupied each station, went on strike, so that gradually all railway traffic ceased except for a few military trains. By the end of the month, not a single ton of coal had reached France, and the resistance only stiffened as the mass arrests and deportations of Germans began. By the end of the Ruhr struggle several thousand persons had been imprisoned and heavily fined, and some 1,40,000 men, women and children summarily deported at a few hours' notice. Over one hundred Germans were killed by French and Belgian troops, who themselves lost a score through German violence. Those imprisoned often suffered severely; there were many authenticated instances of brutal treatment."

The difficulties in the way of maintaining the strike were great, as huge sums were spent on strike salaries and indemnifying those connected with the industry. It was a government fighting another government with non-violent resistance. The resistance was non-violent indeed, but it had to be supported by funds. Conditions in India may be vastly different, especially in war conditions. But there is enough patriotism in the land to muster moral strength to paralyse all departments that help to maintain the existence of the invader.

In spite of the German government's insistence on non-violence there were stray acts of violence, e. g. derailment of running trains, bombs placed on running trains by saboteurs and so on. The French established a complete military and customs cordon, eminent citizens were forced to travel as hostages on French trains and so on. There was a severe embargo on migration from the occupied territory and 'the frontier was hermetically sealed.' Newspapers were suppressed and their editors deported. The chaotic state of German finance affected passive resistance which had to be stopped in September 1923. 'But the French slowly realised that though German resistance was broken, they had not established a lasting system.'

The struggle still went on, the French trying various new methods, but by November 1924 there was a total economic evacuation and military evacuation began in July 1925, the towns of Dusseldorf, Dinsburg, and Ruhrort being evacuated on August 5th.

"If ever – says Rene Gerin – there was an expedition which resembled an aggression, it was the invasion of the Ruhr ordered by Poincare. The result – because Germany organized a passive resistance – what was it but a painful defeat for France and a brilliant victory for Germany?"

What one has to remember is that in war repression would be ten times as severe as was resorted to by France, but if there is the will to suffer, the resourcefulness to devise ways and means on the lines indicated in these different instances of passive resistance, and above all the determination to drive out the invader, cost what it may, victory is certain. The vastness of our country, far from being a disadvantage, may be an advantage, as the invader would find it difficult to cope with resistance on a thousand and one fronts.

M. D.

Hindustani

Apropos of the work that is now being done by Hindustani Prachar Sabha, Kaka Saheb sends me the following excerpt from *Young India*, August 18th, 1921.

"So many Hindi-speaking friends have been anxious for me to make myself responsible for publishing a Hindi edition of the *Navajivan*.

* * *

"I know that several translations in Hindi appear in different parts of India. But the desire has been to put under one cover an authorised free translation of selected articles from the *Navajivan* and *Young India*. This is now being done. The Hindi of the edition will really be Hindustani, a resultant of Hindi and Urdu — simple words understood by both Hindus and Musalmans. An attempt will be made to avoid ornamentation. Indeed I would love to give a simultaneous transcript in the Urdu character. But that cannot be as yet."

It reminds the readers and me that I expressed years ago the views I am now expressing and seeking to emphasize. The way to accomplish the end has been only now found, namely, that a large number of persons should speak and write Hindi and Urdu with equal facility. The forthcoming first examination will show how many have accepted the way.

Sevagram M. K. G.

VANSITTARTS LET LOOSE

'Vansittartism' is a new word which has come into being recently. The Vansittarts look forward to a victorious peace and a new world order in which the British will remain prouder masters of their possessions and Germany will be more defeated and humbled than she was in 1918. Prof. Laski and others protest against this and say that while Mr. Churchill is justly out to destroy the power of Hitlerism, he will do nothing to 'destroy the forces out of which Hitlerism grew'; and yet they cannot brook India being made free from British domination during the war. So the Vansittarts do not mind these mild protests and merrily go on with the pursuit of their dreams. Mr. Amery who has now vowed vengeance against the Congress belongs to the tribe of Vansittarts which is not yet extinct, and so he said some days ago at the London University explaining why there were more students going in for the study of Japanese than any other oriental language:

"That is I think because they are so convinced (that) before long it will be their task to examine Japanese prisoners, whether in the countries we recover or in Japan itself. After the war a new world is going to open, a world in which we shall have great responsibilities — responsibilities of restoring and giving a new and richer life to the countries which have been under the British flag and which shall come back under that flag."

Let us compare with this grand passage a specimen of Mr. Churchill's oratory:

"So besotted is the man in his lust for blood and conquest, so blasting is the power he wields over the lives of Germans, that he even blurted out the other day that his armies would be better clothed and his locomotives better prepared for their second winter in Russia than they were for the first."

Even the devil must have his due. Why is Hitler besotted? Merely because he looks forward to his army being ready to withstand another fearful winter? What should be said then of Mr. Amery who thinks in terms of the conquest of Japan and reconquest of countries back under the British flag?

The Amerys and Churchills still think in terms of the British flag — the flag which Conrad Noel has called the 'Flag of Empire', inasmuch as it came into being in the year 1801 on the compulsory Union of Ireland with England, a union which Gladstone described as 'a case which, on the part of England or of those in authority, combined violence and fraud, baseness, tyranny and cruelty, in a degree rarely if ever paralleled in history.' Conrad Noel in describing the 'bloody' character of that Flag quotes Gooch and Mrs. Green and Lecky. Gooch wrote: 'If ever a statute has lacked moral validity it is the Act of Union of 1800. The Irish people were sold over the counter, and the methods by which a majority was secured, form perhaps the most disgraceful chapter in the modern history of Great Britain.' Mrs. Green wrote that 'the Act of Union was formed in the British Cabinet, unsolicited by the Irish Nation, passed in the middle of war, in the centre of a tremendous military force.' Lecky, a supporter of the British Empire, described the measure as carried 'before it had been demanded by any section of Irish opinion, by gross corruption, in opposition to the majority of the free constituencies and the great preponderance of the unbribed intellect of Ireland.'

Mr. Amery must retain India under the British flag and maintain the Empire, disgrace or no disgrace, morality or no morality. That is the new world order he promised to his countrymen! **M. D.**

NOW OR NEVER

Some of the remarks of Lt. Col. S. T. Moore, Public Relations Officer, Army Air Forces in India, Burma, and China, before the Delhi Press Association should go a great way in heping us to understand the misunderstanding, misrepresentation, and anger that we find in almost every thing that has been wired out recently by Reuter, for our consumption, from the American press. Lt. Col. Moore said: 'The *Statesman* commented in a recent Sunday issue that probably most Americans get their ideas of India from Kipling. I think to a degree that is so . . . . I am sure most intelligent Americans have knowledge and admiration for the spiritual qualities of your Mahatma Gandhi. I would further say that the practical political aspect of Indian affairs is patently too complicated for American judgment, and it is a matter of American military policy *not* to become involved in your internal political affairs.' One wishes those who set any store by American press comments realised the truth of these remarks. But whether they do or not, one cannot afford to be angry with these ignorant press comments. If the political aspect of Indian affairs is too complicated for American judgment one can understand Americans who have admiration for 'the spiritual qualities of Mahatma Gandhi' suddenly beginning to think that he is quite unspiritual when he is asking for full and immediate freedom of India. The complications are made much worse for them by propagandist broadcasts like those of Sir Stafford Cripps and tendencious reports sent out to America by an interested news agency.

But not all America thinks in that distorted way, not all America can be duped by British official broadcasts. Dr. Frank Laubach who was in India a little while ago, and who claims to 'know India better than the United States, (having) spent twenty-seven years of my life in the Far East', said, speaking at a large mass meeting in Duluth (Minnesota): 'What India wants is freedom *now*. And unless Churchill can be persuaded to stop parleying and give India that freedom, she will go over to the Axis. Even now Bose, number-three man in India is in Berlin broadcasting daily to the people of India to throw over the white man's selfish friendship and join the Axis. Nehru and Gandhi, who alone can prevent that, have spent so many years in English jails that they are through with promises. The hour is desperately late.'

Dr. Laubach probably did not know details of Indian history since the outbreak of the war, how British statesmen have haggled with India, and how 'even in penance they have planned sins anew.' But he knows the Britisher to the fingertips and he

has a vivid knowledge of the impending danger. That is why he felt like warning the Americans that 'the greatest of the tragedies of history' should be averted. He proceeded: 'We have every right to urge our President to go 'all out' for Indian freedom. Churchill has recently told the world that he has been working from the beginning to bring America into the war on England's side and that the accomplishment of that goal outweighs all other gains since the start of the conflict. In view of the Nazi-Japanese menace to our freedom, that is as it should be. But unless we act now to influence him to grant India freedom we shall spend our man-power and treasure in the vain effort to hold England's subject peoples in bondage in defiance of the guarantees of the Atlantic Charter — and we shall probably lose the war!'

'Half the population of the world lives in Asia,' added Dr. Laubach. 'The reason Japan has had such easy sailing so far is that subject native populations have had no incentive to fight for the white man. The Philippines is the only country where the natives have felt like fighting. It is the only country where the white man has done a fairly good job for the native. Everywhere else the predatory rich white men have exploited their brown and yellow brothers while they made vague promises about the future. Gandhi and Nehru aren't interested in our new American Military Mission to India, unless we can help free impoverished India *now*.'

Some of those who attended the meeting referred to the Hindu Muslim problem. '*That problem*,' said Dr. Laubach, '*can and must wait. The only thing that will swing India to the Allies is freedom now. Without that the war is already lost*.'

It was, says the reporter, a tremendous meeting. They showered collection plates with one-dollar and five-dollar bills to pay for cablegrams to be sent to Mr. Churchill, Archbishop of Canterbury, to Gandhiji and Pandit Nehru, and a telegram to President Roosevelt. Here was the cablegram to Gandhiji and Jawaharlal:

'We share your faith in the invincible power of love. We want India freed and are working for that cause in England.'

The cablegram was never delivered to Gandhiji, and India was told nothing about that meeting held on March 12. The cablegram to Mr. Churchill said: 'Do not allow the words too little and too late to apply to India', and the telegram to President Roosevelt said: 'Please urge Britain to grant India the four freedoms immediately. Also transmit America's affection to Gandhi and Nehru and ask them what we can do to help India. In this crisis you must leave nothing undone. The hour is desperately late. The next two weeks may decide the fate of humanity for a thousand years. The words 'too little and too late' must not apply to India.'

President Roosevelt could not obviously transmit that message to Gandhiji or Jawaharlal, but he might have saved India the insult of the Cripps' proposals. The hour is desperately late, but the error can still be retrieved.

Sevagram, 31-7-'42 M. D.

DEMANDS OF MARWAR LOK PARISHAD

(*By M. K. Gandhi*)

The following are the demands of the Marwar Lok Parishad in Jodhpur as supplied to me:

"1. The Government of Jodhpur shall reaffirm the terms of the compromise of 1940 arrived at between the Government and the Marwar Lok Parishad as a result of the last satyagrah movement in Marwar.

2. The Government shall see that rule of law is established in the State and more especially in the Jagiri areas and that full Civil Liberties (in terms of the agreement of 1940) are enjoyed by the Lok Parishad workers without any fear of intimidation or victimisation (i. e. physical violence or damage to property, etc.) at the hands of Jagirdars or their subordinates.

3. The New Reforms (Advisory Assembly) recently introduced shall immediately be scrapped and the Constitutional Reforms originally passed in the Council and assented to by His Highness the Maharaja shall instead be introduced as an earnest of further Constitutional development on the path to full Responsible Government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja Saheb Bahadur.

4. The Municipal Act (passed in 1940 but not yet enforced) shall be revised consistently with the growing needs and aspirations of the people and real Local Self-government shall be established with the peoples' representatives enjoying real powers.

5. Government shall make effective and satisfactory arrangements for regular Latai.

Note: In this connection mention must be made of the circular of the Government to the district officers ordering them to arrange for regular Latai at places where it was delayed. The circular was unfortunately withdrawn by the Government in 1941 thereby leaving the district authorities powerless and the cultivators at the mercy of the Jagirdars.

6. The exaction of illegal and unlawful cesses and other exactions shall immediately be stopped and proper arrangements shall forthwith be made to see that the practice is not resumed. In addition, the Government shall appoint a Commission of inquiry to go into the Jagiri problem as a whole to make necessary recommendations regarding the levy of various cesses, taxes and other exactions held lawful at present.

7. The Government shall immediately enforce the Registration of Arms Act in the case of Jagirdars also. The present policy of making invidious discrimination between the Jagirdar class, in whose case the date of registration is being postponed from month to month, and the rest of the people, who have been compelled to register their arms and secure licences for possessing them, is fraught with grave consequences for the internal peace and security of Marwar especially in these days of grave crisis.

8. An inquiry shall also be held into the following happenings:

(a) The excesses committed by the Jagirdars and their men on the Lok Parishad workers in the Jagirs of Chandawal, Ladnun, Roru etc.

(b) Ill-treatment meted out by the jail authorities to the political prisoners.

(c) The lathi charge and other excesses of the 19th June and the subsequent days."

There is nothing in the demands that one can cavil at. There is nothing extravagant in them. They take note of the limitations of Rajputana States whatever the cause thereof. It is for the compliance with these demands that Shri Jainarain Vyas and his companions are in jail and Bisa lost his life. It is for that reason that many Jodhpuris including women — a strange sight in Jodhpur — have resolved to offer civil disobedience. Let me hope that the Jodhpur Durbar will satisfy the moderate demands of the Parishad and let me further hope that the people of Jodhpur having resolved upon achieving their purpose through suffering will not rest till they have reached their immediate goal.

On way to Bombay, 2-8-'42

CASUAL NOTES

The Common Man in America

An American friend has addressed a strong letter of protest to the editor of the *Life* magazine against its remarks on the Chiang-Gandhi meeting in India as unworthy and unfair and thus writes to Gandhiji:

"I have read with intense interest of your recent converastion with certain newspaper correspondents and in particular with Mr. Steele. As an American myself I feel you are entirely right in your stand for India's freedom, but also your stand may and I hope will, give the necessary moral watchword to make the Allied cause successful. The average Allied soldier is moved hither and thither and told to fight for ideals which he is not at all convinced his leaders themselves embody or believe in. Therefore those ideals, have become so vitiated, intangible and so platitudinous that the soldiers and sailors unconsciously to themselves often lack the energetic will to victory.

"Please do not be upset by the American Press extracts reprinted in India. They pass through many hands. Omissions and deletions can easily make white into black. The hearts of most of the common men in America, I feel sure, respond to the cry for freedom which you continue to raise. In fact you are immensely benefiting the whole world by reiterating time and again that *freedom* is at stake."

The 'Communists'' Position

The Communists, I am glad, have won *their* liberty. They desrved it, even if they had not paid for it the price of supporting the war-effort. But I wonder if they have won the liberty of India. They have not only foresworn their country's liberty but their own principles. Sir Ernest Benn, with special reference to Sir Stafford Cripps' broadcast in May said: 'It requires more mental agility than I possess to twist war — hitherto held up as a capitalistic device for the enslavement of workers — into the instrument by means of which the socialists' millenium is to be brought into being.'

But that is the result of the advent of Stalinism which means the acceptance of the theory that Socialism can be achieved by total war. Our Communists are playing into the hands of Sir Stafford and the British workers who are opposed to the independence of India and the colonies, for they fear that with their Independence the industries of England would perish. The policy of the working class towards the colonies was discussed at the second Congress of the Communist International. In reply to the discussion Lenin said: 'I wanted to point out further the importance of revolutionary work of the Communist Parties not only in their own country, but among the soldiers which the exploiting nations use to hold the peoples of their colonies in subjection. Comrade Quelch of the British Socialist Party spoke about this in our commission. He declared that 'the rank and file English worker would count it treachery to help the enslaved peoples in their revolts against English rule'. That has been the bane of the European Socialists' Colonial policy since their Stuttgart meeting in 1907. Some of them openly said that 'Europe needs colonies. Without colonies we shall sink to the level of China,' and Ramsay MacDonald supported this cry. Lenin saw the evil clearly and he said: 'But a wide colonial policy has led to the European Proletariat party falling into such a position that the whole of society does *not* exist by its labour, but by the labour of the almost enslaved colonial slaves. The English bourgeoisie, for example, draws bigger revenues from the tens and hundreds of millions of the population of India and their other colonies than from the English workers. In such conditions in certain countries a material and economic basis is created for the poisoning of the proletariat of this or that country by colonial jingoism.'

'The Real Fifth Column in India'

The Indian section of the Fourth International realises this position and is therefore all out for immediate independence. Henry Judd describes the British as the 'real fifth column in India' and says: 'The probability of a successful military defense of India from Axis attack appears remote indeed. The British — the *real* fifth column in India — have by their actions cleared the way for an easy march of the Axis troops from Calcutta to Bombay. Certainly the numerous fiascos of the United Nations in the defense of their other ill-gotton colonial possessions in Asia would hardly stand up as encouragement for what will happen in India.' He then suggests a way of preventing the disaster of the Axis powers overrunning India:

"How can this disaster be prevented, even at this terribly late hour? Will the people of India have to pay with their lives and their blood for the two centuries of criminal British action? What is necessary is to find a way of shaking off the hand of British rule, and at the same time rallying the people of India in their own defense. The people of India must defend themselves through their own independent action and initiative against the power that rules them today and against the approaching Japanese bandits."

The Fourth International suggests a programme for a political struggle with the British, the formation of a Constituent Assembly, and fighting the Japanese. The two latter things, it will be seen, are possible only after a non-violent programme for demanding the British withdrawal.

Define Hypocrisy!

The Congress is being charged with hypocrisy, even by a British journal like the *New Statesman* which has throughout criticised most strongly the British policy in India. 'The Congress made its claim for India's independence,' it says, 'not merely in a form which Britain cannot accept, but in a form which it cannot have believed would be accepted', and then it charges the Congress with finding under Gandhiji's leadership 'negation and protest for ever congenial but shrinks from risks of power and responsibility'. It knows full well that there is no question of shrinking from these risks, for the simple reason that no one will offer them. And yet it is this same journal that said a little while ago that Britain has no title to India's loyalty. This is what it wrote on the arrest of the Burmese Premier U. Saw:

"To call this man (U. Saw) a Quisling is to invert the facts. On the evidence he is one of the least pro-Japanese of Burman politicians he appears to be a Burman patriot who offered on terms to forget that we conquered his country. We rejected his very modest conditions and he has presumably decided to ask whether Japan would do more. What is Britain's title to his 'loyalty'? That we drain away the natural riches of his country, teak, tin and oil? We owe the assurances he sought in vain to ourselves, his countrymen and all our allies. *What we owe to Burma we owe in even ampler measure to India.* By refusing to free dependencies, we feed the arsenals of Japan with political fuel as for years we fed them with aviation spirit (gasoline). Not so can Hitler be destroyed." (Italics mine)

But we shall be told, it was not immediate independence that was meant, it was independence at some future date!

The Glaring Contrast

Here is a news item taken from the *Searchlight:*

'Special hostels have lately been opened 'somewhere in Calcutta' to provide Eastern Army troops on leave in the city with accommodation for a brief holiday. The hostels have double advantage of being within financial reach of the soldiers and of being centres of recreation, where the residents find plenty of material for amusement and relaxation.

'The greater part of the recreation provided at these hostels is the result of voluntary financial assistance by the civilian population of India and is deeply appreciated by the troops. Soldiers returning from leave speak highly of the arrangements made at the hostels for their comfort and amusement; and a direct result of their popularity is an increasing demand by troops for a holiday-visit to Calcutta.'

Contrast with this the following extract from the report received from those who had been deputed to inquire into the grievances of some villagers who had been asked to vacate thier houses for the construction of aerodromes:

'Out of 47 houses 17 have been demolished. No written notice was issued to owners of houses. An announcement by beat of drum ordering to vacate the house within three days and forcible occupation and confiscation of removable property in case of noncompliance was threatened. On expiry of three days houses were seized and soon after levelled to the ground. The occupants were not offered any other place to live in nor any transport facility was given. Some of them after much difficulty shifted to some unknown place but the majority are staying with their women and children under the shade of trees in the neighbourhood without any protection from sun and rain.'

The obvious reasons for the contrast? The country belongs to the soldiers foreign or other, not to the poor villagers! **M. D.**

Magan Dipa

Gram Udyoga Patrika is little known to the general public. It is the organ of the A. I. V. I. A. edited by Dr. Bharatan Kumarappa and published from Maganwadi. It contains solid reading matter for those who are interested in the revival of village industries. The worth of such writings is specially appreciated during these times when we are compelled more and more to rely upon what villages can supply. Thus we may have no paraffin for domestic use. We have very little even now. Maganwadi has produced a lamp which enables one to use the indigenous oils. The experiment that has so far succeeded refers to the use of *sarso* oil. The success is so gratifying that in Maganwadi only that oil is used for lighting purposes. The lantern is an adaptation of the usual hurricane article. Sri Satyan of the Nalwadi Ashram is its inventor. He is adopting these lanterns for dispatch as samples only. The current number of the Patrika is devoted solely to the Magan Dipa as the adapted lantern has been named. For the inventive faculty as applied to village tools and products is the special legacy of the late Maganlal Gandhi after whom the institution and the museum are named. For further particulars I must refer the curious reader to the Patrika which can be had on application to the manager, Maganwadi, Wardha.

Sevagram, 2-8-'42 **M. K. G.**

CONTENTS

		PAGE
UNSEEMLY IF TRUE	M. K. GANDHI	261
AN APPROPRIATE QUESTION ...	M. K. GANDHI	261
DRAFT RESOLUTION FOR THE A. I. C. C.		262
CHARKHA JAYANTI	M. K. GANDHI	263
TO AMERICAN FRIENDS	M. K. GANDHI	264
QUESTION BOX	M. K. GANDHI	265
UNWORTHY PROPAGANDA ...	M. D.	265
WAYS OF NON-VIOLENT NON-COOPERATION ...	M. D.	267
VANSITTARTS LET LOOSE ...	M. D.	269
NOW OR NEVER	M. D.	269
DEMANDS OF MARWAR LOK PARISHAD ...	M. K. GANDHI	270
CASUAL NOTES	M. D.	271
NOTES		
HINDUSTANI	M. K. G.	268
MAGAN DIPA	M. K. G.	272

Printed and Published by Jivanji Dahyabhai Desai, Navajivan Press, Kalupur, Ahmedabad
Subscription Rates — INLAND: One year, Rs. 5, six months. Rs. 3. FOREIGN: One year, Rs. 7 or 12 sh. or $. 3